DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 353 HE 012 967

AUTHOR Curby, Vicki Morgan
TITLE Women Administrators in Higher Education: Their Geographic Mobility. Ruth Strang Research Award Monograph Series: No. 4.
INSTITUTION National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 29p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1625 I St., NW, Washington, DC 20006 ($4.00 members, $5.00 nonmembers)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes: Administrator Characteristics: *Administrators: *College Administration: Employment Opportunities: *Females: Higher Education: Migration: *Occupational Mobility: Promotion (Occupational): *Relocation

ABSTRACT

Relationships between selected characteristics of women administrators and their geographical mobility were studied. In addition to identifying variables associated with the geographic mobility of women administrators, factors women administrators identify in considering relocation are described. Questionnaire responses were analyzed for 1,389 women administrators belonging to the American Association for Higher Education and/or the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors. Study findings led to the following conclusions: (1) women administrators demonstrate a propensity toward geographic mobility; (2) women administrators are generally willing to make geographic changes to accept jobs for economic reasons, such as high salary, as well as for opportunities for upward professional mobility; and (3) the conditions that are generally essential or important enough to justify a change in location for women administrators are job-related rather than based on personal or social preferences. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191353

Women Administrators in Higher Education Their Geographic Mobility

Vicki Morgan Curby, Ph.D.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NDWDAC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Ruth Strang Research Award Monograph Series: No 4

HE 012 962

National Association for Women Deans,
Administrators, and Counselors
1625 I St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

The Ruth Strang Award

The National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors established a specific Research and Publication Fund in late 1970. Following Ruth Strang's death, the Association named this fund the Ruth Strang Research Fund to honor her memory. This monograph contains the paper which won the fourth annual Ruth Strang Award.

Professor Strang was internationally known and esteemed for her perceptive research and writing, especially in the fields of reading, gifted children, and student development work, and for her years of dedicated teaching. A substantial part of her career was spent at Columbia University Teachers College where hundreds of men and women were exposed to her good mind and her gentle person. On hearing of the award, one of her former students wrote, "I hope innovative approaches to counseling education constitute another way of expressing admiration for her work. It was in her course that I first found emphasis on the concept of empathy." She served for many years as the Editor of *The Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors* and contributed immeasurably to its stature.

Vicki M. Curby, the winner of the 1979 Ruth Strang Research Award, holds the B.A. degree, cum laude, from Wake Forest University and the M.S. degree from Florida State University. She completed her Ph.D. degree in higher and adult education at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

In addition to being a member of several professional organizations and Kappa Delta Pi, Vicki Curby's name has appeared in *Outstanding Young Women in America* in 1972 and *Who's Who of American Women*, 1979-1980.

To obtain the data for this study, Dr. Curby surveyed 1,600 women administrators. The paper, one of fifty submitted for the award, presents findings about women who hold administrative positions in higher education.

Ann Bromley, Chairperson
1979 Ruth Strang Award Committee

Copyright © 1980 by the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors
Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Page

Chapters

I Introduction 5

II The Concept of Geographic Mobility and Related Studies 8

III Methodology 10

IV Personal, Educational and Professional Characteristics of Women Administrators 11

V Conditions Promoting Geographic Mobility 13

VI Geographic Mobility and Related Variables 17

VII Conclusions and Recommendations 23

References 24

List of Tables 29

1 Introduction

Although the last ten years has marked an increase in the amount of research on women in higher education, the bulk of this research has been directed toward women faculty members. Only a few studies have viewed the role and characteristics of women administrators (Arter, 1972; Astin, 1977; Gardner, 1966; Goerss, 1975; Kaufman, 1961; Nieboir, 1975; Van Alstyne and Withers, 1977; Walsh, 1975).

Participation by women in the administration of colleges and universities has been conspicuously lacking. Women have been most often located in middle-management level positions that related very little to policy-making and involved sex stereotypes (Oltman, 1970). Astin (1977) found that women occupy seven of the eight lowest-paying professional positions on campus. In a study of administrators in the Ivy League universities and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Mattfield (1974) found that seventy-five percent of women working as administrators during 1972-73 were working in student services.

Data available from institutional reports about administrative women have been sparse and lack uniformity. Two trends are apparent from institutional reports: (1) the higher the positions, the fewer the women, and (2) women administrators have been found in traditionally women's fields, have been in positions that lacked high-level administrative authority, and often remained in administrative positions which have been the beginning posts for many men (Robinson, 1972).

According to a study of employment patterns and salary levels of women and minority group members, women are paid less than men. They also hold a small percentage of administrative positions other than "affirmative-action officer" unless in an institution with a large women's enrollment (Van Alstyne and Withers, 1977).

Women administrators face certain constraints and barriers to their career development. A combination of complex institutional, cultural, and personal factors were identified as barriers in a study of career patterns of women administrators by Gasser (1975). Married women cited the following as major barriers: interruption of employment due to pregnancy, family responsibilities, and following their husbands to new positions. In a study of women doctorates, Astin (1969) found that the husband's mobility was the third greatest barrier to career development. The idea that women lack geographic mobility—the ability to pursue career opportunities even when relocation is involved—has been a widely held assumption (Caplow, 1954; Carnegie, 1973; Ginzberg, 1961; Janeway, 1971).

In a study of psychologists in the western United States, Wittig and Nolfi (1976) found a higher percentage of women than men indicated that they had been offered a lesser job because a prospective employer knew they lacked geographic mobility. They also noted that married women, at a ratio of ten to one over men, reported that their spouse's employment was a consideration when seeking their present employment. The lack of mobility can create a loss of bar-

gaining power. Men may receive attractive offers from other institutions that involve large salary increases. They may accept the offer and, thus, the salary increase or negotiate an even greater increase at their present institution. Negotiating on the basis of another job offer is not very convincing for a married woman unless it is clear that her husband is contemplating a move to the same area. Furthermore, it is not likely that a married woman would receive an unsolicited job offer involving a geographical move because of the assumption she would not be likely to accept the offer (Carnegie Commission, 1973). Lacking availability and not being an autonomous force in the competitive job market may lead to exploitation that can result in an inferior work situation.

Statement of the Problem

Women working in administrative areas in higher education are concentrated in lower level positions. Due to increasing interest in the status of women and recent federal legislation, there is a growing concern about the number of women in administrative positions. One specific dimension of the employment of women is their geographic mobility. In considering the employment of women in higher education administration, information about their geographic mobility could be helpful to have but has not been adequately collected or analyzed. An understanding of employment patterns and trends is a necessary component of a more complete picture of the employment of women in our colleges and universities. A direct query of women in administrative positions should provide a more definitive understanding of the variables associated with their geographic mobility.

Executive Order 11246 as amended by *Executive Order 11375* is violated by recruiting and hiring decisions which are governed by unverified assumptions about a particular individual's willingness or ability to relocate because of his or her race or sex (United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1972). In affirmative action plans, the criteria for determining underutilization of women involves (1) the availability of women seeking employment in the labor or recruitment area of the college or university and (2) the availability of promotable and transferable female employees within the institutions. Demographic data collected regarding women administrators should give useful information regarding the existing pool of women workers in the field and the various administrative areas as well as the extent of their qualifications and experience.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify relationships between selected characteristics of women administrators and their geographical mobility; to identify the variables which are associated with the geographic mobility of women administrators; and to describe the factors which women administrators identify as constraints in their own geographic mobility and the conditions important to them in considering relocation.

Definition of Terms

This research was limited to the determinants of geographic mobility. The study was in the context of the personal and social effects of geographic mobility. Geographic mobility was defined as the willingness to take another job that is presumably available even when relocation is involved. In this study,

mobile women administrators were those who indicated they would change jobs even if the change was accompanied by a change of residence of at least fifty miles. *Immobile women administrators* were those who indicated they would not change jobs when the change would be accompanied by a change of residence of at least fifty miles. *Administrators* were limited to full-time professional employees with titles such as those listed below:

Upper level administrators had titles such as president, chancellor, vice-president, provost, dean, director.

Lower level administrators had titles such as assistant or associate dean or director, department chairperson, coordinator, assistant to, adviser, and program director.

Institutions of higher education were accredited institutions in the United States as listed in the *Education Directory: Colleges and Universities, 1976-77* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977). Members of religious orders and individuals on active military duty were excluded since their methods and motives in mobility may not in all cases be self-initiated.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation to this study, which should be noted in the interpretation and generalization of the results, is that the subjects were drawn from directories of two professional organizations in higher education. Generalization of the results of this study to women administrators not appearing in these directories may be inappropriate. It also may be inappropriate to make generalizations regarding other types of mobility.

Assumptions of the Study

An important assumption made in this study was that the women administrators answered seriously and to the best of their ability the questions posed in the study and that they were best qualified to provide insight concerning their mobility. The variables of mobility identified from the literature were assumed to be representative and accurately identified. The questionnaire, after initial testing, was assumed to have relatively high reliability and validity. It was also assumed that the listing of higher education institutions contained in *Education Directory: Colleges and Universities, 1976-77* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977) and the directories of the national associations were complete and accurate.

II The Concept of Geographic Mobility and Related Studies

Since moving is a common practice in the United States and such an important characteristic of our society, it is a significant topic for research. Projections have been that each American born during the 1960's will change residence an average of fourteen times in his or her lifetime (Berry and Gillard, 1977). Labor mobility can be studied from different frames of reference: (1) the goals of workers and their opportunities to attain them, (2) the class structure of society, and (3) the personal and social effects. Mobility in relation to the process of labor allocation, its determinants, and its extent and character have been the concern of actual studies that have been conducted. Conceptually, labor mobility can be viewed as a capacity, willingness, or act of movement (Parnes, 1954).

Labor mobility embraces a number of different types of employment change. *Interfirm* mobility involves a change of firms or employers. *Occupational* mobility relates to a change of occupation. *Industrial* mobility relates to a change of industry. *Geographic* mobility concerns a change of job that necessitates a change of residence, i.e. a move from one local labor market to another (Shea, 1970). There is also movement from unemployed to employed status, employed to unemployed, and into and out of the labor force. All of these are not mutually exclusive.

The frame of reference for this study is the personal and social effects of labor mobility. It is a study of the determinants of labor mobility with a focus on geographic mobility—the willingness, given the opportunity, to make a move involving the change of locations.

Previous research on geographic mobility has focused on explaining workers' movements with orthodox economic theory. The crux of research prior to 1970 was consistently the matter of how well orthodox economic theory performed as a device to explain movement of workers between various sectors of the labor market (Gallaway, 1969). The workers evaluated alternative employment opportunities by the economic advantage of the new situation. In addition to having theoretical and methodological problems, this conventional approach has been difficult to prove (Greenwood, 1975; Somers, 1967). Non-economic factors influence the employment-related decisions of workers. Political, sociological, and psychological factors contribute to the decision-making process. When one is faced with the option to change locations, environmental perceptions and relationships to groups, other individuals, and the community come into play. Also, individual characteristics and personal motivations influence a worker's propensity to move (Gallaway, Gilbert, and Smith, 1967; Kosinski and Prothero, 1975; Parnes, 1954).

Studies of workers in general have produced data concerning personal demographic characteristics from which researchers have drawn conclusions about geographic mobility (Bunting, 1960; Lansing and Mueller, 1967; Parnes, 1954; Shryock, 1964). The most firmly established characteristic that influences geographic mobility is age (Lansing and Mueller, 1967). Mobility slackens as age in-

creases. Other factors that have accounted for explained variance in geographic mobility are income, regional location, sex, family size, marital status, and the structural conditions of work and career. Most studies have found women to be less geographically mobile than men (Bogue, 1952; Bunting, 1960; Bunting, Ashley, and Prosper, 1961; Eldridge and Wolkstein, 1956; University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center, 1950; Niemi, 1975). Ladinsky (1976) found professional females began to migrate earlier than males and, in the aggregate, moved less than males.

The research on mobility of workers in educational institutions has focused on those who teach (Anderson and Larson, 1974; Caplow and McGee, 1958; Cottingham, 1964, Crane, 1970; DeJesus, 1965; Ferris, 1966; Fincher, 1967; Hargens and Hagsrom, 1970; Shapiro, 1971; Stecklein and Lathrop, 1960). Different areas of specialization as well as types of institutions have been the subject of research. Even though the study of mobility is not a predictive science, it appears that faculty at the lower ranks who are male and young are more likely to be mobile. Although some researchers (Astin, 1969; Kimmel, 1972) have indicated no difference in the mobility patterns of men and women, others (Arter, 1972; Fecher, 1973) have found little difference in the geographic relocation abilities of the members of the two sexes. Two studies of faculty members (Brown, 1967; Marshall, 1964) concluded that women were less mobile than men.

In terms of specific reasons for faculty movement, Orlick (1966) noted that female teachers moved because of working conditions and male teachers moved for primary economic reasons. The Erickson (1968) study revealed that the influence of a faculty member's family and friends was a major consideration in the decision to leave an institution. Kimmel (1972) noted that men, more often than women, reported changing jobs in order to achieve professional advancement or because of job dissatisfaction. Walsh (1975) found the two main factors which women administrators thought important and essential if they were to seek another position were more involvement in decision-making and a better chance for advancement. The ability to relocate was among the three most important factors which affected women's changes for advancement on the job.

In her study of women in instructional middle management in California community colleges, Bock (1976) found forty-four percent of the single women and thirty-two percent of the married women were willing to commute up to fifty miles, with nearly ten percent more single than married women willing to relocate within California or out of state. After ten years on campus, women were less willing to either commute or relocate.

In summary, academic workers move for the following reasons: (1) the working conditions, (2) the influence of family and friends, (3) the achievement of professional advancement, (4) creative work, and (5) the competency of their colleagues. Such reasons often outrank salary considerations in determining propensity to move. It is evident from the literature that a theory of mobility has not been developed, but that factors associated with mobility can be described.

III Methodology

Population

The population for the study was the women administrators appearing on the October, 1977 membership lists of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) and the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors (NAWDAC) who obviously or possibly could meet the definitions of this study. In the case of each list, if it was impossible to determine if an individual was a member of the research population, she was included. If a title of a person was not specified on the list, the individual was also included. The population of 1,601 individuals consisted of 744 members from AAHE and 857 members from NAWDAC. Members of both organizations were only included once.

Data Collection Procedure and Instrument Used

A questionnaire, which had been field-tested using women administrators at the University of Missouri-Columbia, with a letter asking for cooperation and a stamped return envelope, was sent to the 1,601 administrators. The questions were designed to obtain demographic information, marital and family information, and employment information and career history. The final response to the mailing totaled 1,389 which was 87% of the total population. After the elimination of those not fitting the definitions of the study, the usable return totaled 1,002.

Treatment of the Data and Statistical Procedures

The questionnaires were coded and tabulated using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (Nie, 1975). Frequency distributions of all information items were computed. Cross tabulations were made to compare the demographic and employment information with geographic mobility.

The data were analyzed by presenting the results of the frequency tabulation of each item and the comparison of each variable with the geographic mobility of the respondents. Geographic mobility was determined by the response to a hypothetical question asking the subjects if they would take another job in higher education that required a move of a distance greater than 50 miles from their current location provided the conditions existed which they had earlier outlined as "essential" or "very important."

10

IV Personal, Educational, and Professional Characteristics of Women Administrators

The data from this study of women administrators who were members of the American Association for Higher Education and the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors showed that they represented all age groups from age 20 to over 66, but on the whole were younger than those in other studies concerning women administrators (Goerss, 1975; Walsh, 1975). Although there was an even distribution of respondents among age categories up to 56 years of age, there was a decline of respondents above age 56. They lived in different sized communities but almost all lived within 50 miles of their place of work. Almost two-thirds of these women owned or had equity in their own home.

Over half of those questioned had earned a masters degree while the doctorate had been earned by one third of the subjects. The percentage of those with a doctoral degree differed from previous studies about women administrators. For example, the doctoral degree was held by fifty percent of upper-level administrators in one study (Gasser, 1975), seventy-five percent of another group (Goerss, 1975), and seventeen percent of still another group (Gardner, 1966). In this study, there was an almost even division between the women administrators who were married and currently living with their husbands (39.1%) and those who were single and had never married (41.3%). Slightly over 10% of the women administrators in this study were divorced. Very small percentages of the women were living with a mate, separated or widowed. The data were consistent with other studies of women administrators which found forty to sixty percent of the participants as or having been married (Goerss, 1977).

Among the population of this study, very few of the participants had children, especially young children under six years of age. Other dependents were almost nonexistent. Almost half of the husbands or mates of these women also worked in education. The next largest group of occupations reported for a spouse or mate was "business or government". The majority of the husbands or mates of the subjects had annual incomes between $15,000 and $30,000.

The employment information gathered in this study was quite varied. To determine whether these women were upper or lower level administrators, they were asked to mark the group of titles in which their title appeared. The majority were in lower level positions. Half (50.1%) of these women administrators worked in student affairs. Over one-fourth worked in academic affairs. The remainder worked in the chief executive office, management and operations, and adult and continuing education or extension.

The years of experience in administration varied from one year to more than eleven. The number of years of service they had at their present institutions were the same. Almost one-third of these women had more than ten years experience in administration. Half of the women had served in their present colleges or uni-

versities for more than six years. Almost 40% of the administrators had served for two to five years. The majority (59.7%) of administrators in this study did not have academic appointments. Of the 412 women who held academic appointments, 43.2% had tenure and 44.6% did not have tenure (12.2% did not indicate whether or not they had tenure).

Past mobility was reflected in the number of times these administrators had changed jobs. The majority had changed jobs three or more times. Employment changes had resulted in changes in geographic location less often but had caused a move at least once for two-thirds of the individuals. Approximately three-fourths of the respondents had incomes below $25,000. This figure is not surprising given the fact that 54.9% of the administrators were in lower level administrative positions. Almost half (48.8%) had incomes below $20,000.

The majority (54.0%) of the administrators in this study were employed at universities. One-third were employed at four-year colleges and 11.5% of the respondents were employed at two-year colleges. More of these women were employed in public institutions than private ones (53.9% vs. 44.2%). A fairly even distribution was reflected in the numbers of students enrolled at the institutions where these women administrators were employed. The largest single percentage was the 28.5% whose institutions enrolled between 1,000-4,999 students. Over half of the administrators worked at schools with less than 10,000 students.

12

V Conditions Promoting Geographic Mobility

In the study of geographic mobility, the women administrators were asked to indicate conditions necessary for them to consider a move to change jobs. The results are presented in Table 1. The three conditions that were checked most often as "essential" were "higher salary", "higher level of administration", and "better chance for advancement". These items had similar levels of response: 30.0%, 26.3%, and 26.0% respectively. The next three conditions which were listed as "essential" to consider a move by more than 10% of the respondents were "spouse or mate having equal or better job", "greater competence and congeniality of colleagues", and "region of the United States". The remaining conditions drew less than a 10% response as "essential".

In considering relocation, greater numbers of the participants in this study indicated that conditions were "very important" rather than "essential". There were six conditions that 30% or greater of the respondents felt were "very important" in considering a geographic change: "cultural opportunities" (40.3%), "region of the United States" (39.0%), "greater competence and congeniality of colleagues" (37.9%), "better chance for advancement" (34.9%), "higher level of administration" (33.7%), and "higher salary" (31.4%).

The conditions that were the least relevant to relocating were "opportunity to conduct research" (36.5%) and "opportunity for more active social life" (33.3%). The most "not applicable" situations were "spouse or mate having equal or better job" (50.3%) and "better schools for my children" (69.2%).

When combining the categories of "essential" and "very important", the conditions that ought to have existed for over half of these women administrators to make geographic changes fall in the following order:

higher salary — 61.3%
better chance for advancement — 60.9%
higher level of administration — 60.0%
greater competence and congeniality of colleagues — 55.2%
region of the United States — 54.9%

Since some conditions were not applicable to substantial numbers of the women, it is useful to consider those who actually rated the item. For those who attached a value to items, the importance of conditions shifts to the following:

other — 90%
spouse or mate having equal or better job — 75%
better chance for advancement — 68%
higher level of administration — 66%
higher salary — 65%
greater competence and congeniality of colleagues — 64%
region of the United States — 56%

Conditions other than those appearing on the questionnaire were important for those who listed them and took priority over anything else. The importance of employment considerations for their spouse or mate is important for those married to or living with someone.

In this study, 639 women could potentially be interested in graduate study beyond the masters degree since they had earned a masters degree or less. Of those who rated the item "opportunity to attend graduate school" only 26% felt that this condition was "essential" or "very important" in considering a change in location to take a different job.

The women administrators in this study were asked to rank order the conditions they had marked "essential" or "very important". The results appear in Table 2. Salary, administrative level, opportunity for advancement, and region of the United States were most often ranked #1 along with importance of their spouse or mate's having an equal or better job and "other" conditions. When looking at the number who marked these items "essential" or "very important" and also ranked them, the following are the conditions in order of ranked importance: other (66%), spouse or mates employment (49%), higher level of administration (31%), salary (23%), chance for advancement (18.7%), region of the United States (18%), and colleague considerations (14%).

The most often mentioned condition to move in the "other" category was the "challenge" of a new position. Thirty percent of those who filled in a response here listed "challenge" as a condition to make a geographic change. In a similar vein, phrases like "new experiences", "stimulating work situations," "opportunity for creativity", "similar in philosophy and values", and "flexibility and independence" were listed. Also, a concern for job security and fringe benefits were expressed by those responding to this item.

"Higher salary," "better chance for advancement" and "higher level of administration" received the largest number of second and third place ranks. These same items were the only ones below the 50% mark where no rank occured.

The respondents in this study who indicated that they would *not* move to accept another job, were asked to indicate the constraints to their being able to relocate. When indicating the constraints, many women merely checked items rather than ranking them. In these situations, each item was given a rank of one; thus, the final tally is not as exact as it could have been had the respondents followed the directions. The data also included the very few cases of women who answered "yes" that they would move to take another job and those who gave answer to this question but felt it necessary to mark the constraints important to them.

Nevertheless, the constraint that received a rank of #1 (indicating that it was the most important outside of the "other" category) was "spouse or mate's job" which had 65 affirmative responses. The respondents listed a variety of constraints that were different from those appearing on the questionnaire. The most often mentioned by far was "age" or "being too close to retirement." Others listed "satisfaction with their present position or location" as a constraint. Elderly or ill family members also served to hold some of these administrators in their present locations.

A similar constraint, "friends and community ties", was the other item that had a relatively large number (53) of first place rankings. This barrier also received a large number of second and third place rankings. Owning one's home was evenly distributed throughout the rank levels by the respondents to this

study. Job security appeared more often in the higher ranks than in the lower ones. The expense of moving a household or dependents was not often ranked as important as a constraint.

The constraints that were ranked by the most individuals regardless of the position of the rank were "friends and community ties", "job security", and "ownership of home". The tabulation of the responses concerning constraints appear in Table 3.

TABLE 1

Conditions Necessary for Women Administrators in Higher Education to Change Location

Condition N = 1002	Essential		Very Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Not Applicable		No Answer	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Size of community	46	4.6	216	21.6	4[illegible]	47.1	167	16.7	14	1.4	87	8.7
Region of the U.S.	129	12.9	391	39.0	326	32.5	84	8.4	7	.7	65	6.5
Higher salary	301	30.0	314	31.3	280	27.9	53	5.3	5	.5	49	4.9
Climate	67	6.7	241	24.1	450	44.9	151	15.1	13	1.3	80	8.0
Spouse or mate having equal or better job	176	17.6	126	12.6	61	6.1	39	3.9	504	50.3	96	9.6
Higher level of administration	264	26.3	338	33.7	212	21.2	112	11.2	17	1.7	59	5.9
Better schools for my children	25	2.5	63	6.3	56	5.6	44	4.4	693	69.2	121	12.1
Better chance for advancement	261	26.0	350	34.9	209	20.9	79	7.9	31	3.1	72	7.2
Greater competence and congeniality of colleagues	173	17.3	380	37.9	221	22.1	82	8.2	69	6.9	77	7.7
Cultural opportunities	89	8.9	404	40.3	363	36.2	50	5.0	19	1.9	77	7.7
Prestige of new institution	59	5.9	244	24.4	428	42.7	164	16.4	23	2.3	84	8.4
Opportunity to attend graduate school	45	4.5	114	11.4	205	20.4	250	25.0	298	29.7	90	9.0
Opportunity to conduct research	29	2.9	98	9.8	287	28.6	366	36.5	128	12.8	94	9.4
Opportunity for more active social life	30	3.0	132	13.2	339	33.8	334	33.3	80	8.0	87	8.7
Other	90	9.0	39	4.0	6	.6	8	.8	37	3.7	822	82.2
Total	1784		3450		3915		1983		1938		1960	

TABLE 2

Ranked Order of Importance of Conditions Necessary for Women Administrators in Higher Education to Change Location

Condition N = 1002	Ranked Position of Importance													
	#1		#2		#3		#4		#5 or lower		No rank			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Size of community	9	9	26	2.6	34	3.4	34	3.4	124	12.4	775	77.3		
Region of the U.S.	93	9.3	92	9.2	62	6.2	68	6.8	143	14.3	544	54.3		
Higher salary	144	14.4	145	14.5	127	12.7	80	8.0	79	7.9	427	42.6		
Climate	20	2.0	54	5.4	53	5.3	34	3.4	108	10.8	733	73.2		
Spouse or mate having equal or better job	149	14.9	55	5.5	38	3.8	18	1.8	21	2.1	721	72.0		
Higher level of administration	186	18.6	136	13.6	103	10.3	59	5.9	66	6.7	449	44.8		
Better schools for my children	6	6	9	.9	17	1.7	16	1.6	25	2.5	929	92.7		
Better chance for advancement	114	11.4	141	14.1	136	13.6	83	8.3	91	9.1	437	43.6		
Greater competence and congeniality of colleagues	78	7.8	88	8.8	74	7.4	81	8.1	166	16.6	515	51.4		
Cultural opportunities	13	1.3	34	3.4	56	5.6	82	8.2	27	23.2	585	58.4		
Prestige of new institution	9	.9	23	2.3	42	4.2	37	3.7	147	14.7	744	74.3		
Opportunity to attend graduate school	18	1.8	23	2.3	19	1.9	28	2.8	57	5.7	857	85.5		
Opportunity to conduct research	4	.4	16	1.6	16	1.6	13	1.3	56	5.6	897	89.5		
Opportunity for more active social life	8	.8	15	1.5	21	2.1	21	2.1	76	7.6	861	85.9		
Other	85	8.5	18	1.8	5	.5	3	.3	6	.6	885	88.3		

TABLE 3

Relocation Constraints of Women Administrators in Higher Education

Constraints N = 1002	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		None	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Ownership of home	25	2.5	28	2.8	22	2.2	21	2.1	16	1.6	2	.2			888	88.6
Friends and community ties	53	5.3	38	3.8	30	3.0	14	1.4	5	.5	4	.4			858	85.6
Spouse or mate's job	65	6.5	15	1.5	12	1.2	3	.3			1	.1			906	90.4
Too expensive to move	5	.5	3	.3	11	1.1	17	1.7	17	1.7	14	1.4	7	.7	929	92.8
Because of dependents	11	1.1	13	1.3	6	.6	5	.5	6	.6	5	.5	4	.4	952	95.0
Job security	30	3.0	38	3.8	21	2.1	12	1.2	6	.6	9	.9	1	.1	885	88.3
Other	76	7.6	9	.9	6	.6	4	.4					2	.2	905	90.3

VI Geographic Mobility and Related Variables

The women administrators in the study of geographic mobility were asked "if another job in higher education were offered to you under ideal conditions (those you answered essential and very important in Question 28), and required you to move a distance greater than 50 miles from your current location, would you take it?" An affirmative response to this question came from 77.6% of these women administrators. Those who answered "no" were 19.0% of the total, while those giving no answer answer comprised 3.6% of the total.

The data presented in Table 4 summarize the results of comparing these women administrators' age and their geographic mobility. It is evident that a decline in geographic mobility occurred after 55 years of age. The percentage of women who were mobile as compared to those who were immobile was greater for the age groups below age 55. The most mobile subjects were those under thirty years of age.

Differences in geographic mobility of women administrators were observed in relation to the size of their place of residence. The least mobile individuals were those living in towns of 25,000 - 50,000 population. Respondents residing in towns with populations below 10,000 appeared to be most mobile. In the comparison between those women administrators who owned or had equity in their homes and their geographically mobility, the data indicate that the most mobile were those who did not own their own home. Nevertheless, 72.8% of the women who owned their own home still considered themselves mobile under ideal conditions. Although the numbers of women in the two categories were small, women administrators who had professional or education specialist degrees appeared to be less mobile than those with other academic degrees. The women administrators who had earned doctorates were more mobile than those with other academic degrees.

A comparison of the marital status of the respondents and their geographic mobility is contained in Table 5. The largest percentage of mobile women administrators was found among those who had been married and were currently separated. The women who were single because they had never married or because they were divorced also were highly mobile. The data presented in Table 5, show that 95.2% of those married but separated, 80.5% of those who were divorced and 80.0% of those who were single and had never married were mobile. Almost 74% of the widows and women who were married and currently living with their husbands were mobile.

Few of the women administrators in this study had children or other dependents. Responses related to dependents and geographic mobility are presented in Table 6. The percentage of mobile individuals among the twenty-two women who had three, four or more children between the ages of six and twenty years of age was less than the percentage of those who had two or fewer children. There was no appreciable difference between the mobile and immobile of those with

younger children. No evidence existed to support the conclusion that dependents other than children reduce the geographic mobility of these women administrators. Several women indicated that their geographic mobility would increase when their children completed school, but for the most part, these women administrators did not give an indication that the presence of dependents would prevent their changing geographic locations to accept employment.

The results of cross-tabulating the occupations of the spouses or mates of these women with their geographic mobility is summarized in Table 7. In these various categories of occupations, two had lower rates of geographic mobility—those who had spouses or mates who were retired, disabled, or unemployed or who were members of the clergy. The two groups with obviously higher rates of geographic mobility were women administrators who were married to or living with persons who were employed in science and research or the crafts or skilled labor.

Women administrators whose husbands or mates had incomes between $10,000 and $14,999 a year expressed a high rate of mobility (see Table 8). Having a husband or mate with an annual income of more than $35,000 decreased the mobility of the women in this study. It should be pointed out that the income of a spouse or mate was not applicable to 469 women, 47.9% of the total.

Of the women administrators who were classified as upper level, 79% indicated that they were mobile compared with 76.2% of the lower level administrators. There was a slight inclination for those in student affairs to be less mobile than women in other administrative areas.

The results of comparing the geographic mobility of women administrators and the number of years of professional experience as well as the years of service they had at their current institutions indicated an incremental decline in geographic mobility as the number of years of experience and service increased. A definite drop existed in the percentage of those who were geographically mobile and had eleven or more years of experience in comparison with the other categories. Almost 90% (88.1%) of those serving one year or less at their current institutions were geographically mobile while only 64.9% of those with eleven or more years of service were geographically mobile.

The women administrators who held an academic appointment and tenure were slightly less geographically mobile than those with an academic appointment and no tenure (see Table 9). Having tenure without having an academic appointment did not make the 11 individuals in this category geographically immobile. All but one indicated they would change locations under ideal conditions.

Women administrators who had made geographic changes in locations previously were more likely to do so again than those who had never moved to change jobs. Of those who had never changed locations, 72% indicated they would move if they recieved a job offer under what they consider ideal conditions.

The comparison between the personal income of women administrators and their geographic mobility is exhibited in Table 10. All of the women making below $10,000 were geographically mobile. The other salary ranges in which the women earning at those levels were slightly more mobile than the average were (1) $10,000 - 14,999, (2) $15,000 - 19,999, (3) $30,000 - 34,999, and (4) $40,000 or more.

The results of comparing the institutional characteristics of type, support, and size of enrollment of institutions at which women administrators were employed

and their geographic mobility did not show strong relationship. The more mobile appeared to come from public universities which were of medium size enrollment.

TABLE 4

Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Age

Age N = 967	Mobile			Immobile			No Response		
	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %
Under 30	138	86.8	14.3	21	13.2	2.2			
31-35	130	83.3	13.4	22	14.1	2.3	4	2.6	.4
36-40	123	79.4	12.7	26	16.8	2.7	6	3.9	.6
41-45	101	75.9	10.4	23	17.3	2.4	9	6.8	.9
46-50	112	82.4	11.6	18	13.2	1.9	6	4.4	.6
51-55	88	76.5	9.1	23	20.0	2.4	4	3.5	.4
56-60	43	58.9	4.4	27	37.0	2.8	3	4.1	.3
61-65	17	44.7	1.8	20	52.6	2.6	1	2.6	.1
66 and older				1	50.0	.1	1	50.0	.1
Total	752		77.8	181		18.7	34		3.5

TABLE 5

Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Marital Status

Marital status N = 1002	Mobile			Immobile			No Answer		
	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %
Single (never married)	331	80.0	33.0	72	17.4	7.2	11	2.7	1.1
Single (living with mate)	5	55.6	.5	3	33.3	.3	1	11.1	.1
Married (living with spouse)	289	73.7	28.8	88	22.4	8.8	15	3.8	1.5
Married (separated)	20	95.2	2.0	1	4.8	.1			
Divorced	95	80.5	9.5	16	13.6	1.6	7	5.9	.7
Widowed	34	73.9	3.4	10	21.7	1.0	2	4.3	.2
Married - commute	1	100.0	.1						
No answer	1	100.0	.1						
Total	776		77.4	190		19.0	36		3.6

TABLE 6

Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Dependents

Dependents N = 1002	Mobile			Immobile			No Answer		
	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %
Children 6-21 years of age									
None	593	78.4	59.2	141	18.7	14.1	22	2.9	2.2
One	79	77.5	7.9	19	19.6	1.9	4	3.9	.4
Two	74	81.3	7.4	11	12.1	1.1	6	6.6	.6
Three	17	60.7	1.7	9	32.1	.9	2	7.1	.2
Four or more	6	50.0	.6	4	33.3	.4	2	16.7	.2
No answer	7	53.8	.7	6	46.2	.6			
Total	776		77.4	190		19.0	36		3.6
Children under 6 years of age									
None	722	78.0	72.1	170	18.4	17.0	34	3.7	3.4
One	28	84.8	2.8	5	15.2	.5			
Two	6	85.7	.6	1	14.3	.1			
No answer	20	55.6	2.0	14	38.9	1.4	2	5.6	.2
Total	766		77.4	190		19.0	36		
Other dependents									
Yes	69	86.3	6.9	8	10.0	.8	3	3.8	.3
No	697	76.6	69.6	181	19.9	18.1	32	3.5	3.2
No answer	10	83.3	1.0	1	8.3	.1	1	8.3	.1
Total	776		77.4	190		19.0	36		3.6

TABLE 7

Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Spouse or Mate's Occupation

Occupation category N = 995 for spouse or mate	Mobile			Immobile			No Answer		
	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %
Business or government	66	75.0	6.6	20	22.7	2.0	2	2.3	.2
Education	121	74.2	12.2	35	21.5	3.5	7	4.3	.7
Professions	33	75.0	3.3	11	25.0	1.1			
Retired, disabled, unemployed	17	65.4	1.7	9	34.6	.9			
Industry	28	73.7	2.8	6	15.8	.6	4	10.5	.4
Crafts and skilled	14	87.5	1.4	2	12.5	.2			
Science and research	18	90.0	1.8	2	10.0	.2			
Clergy	3	60.0	.3	1	20.0	.1	1	20.0	.1
Not applicable	470	79.0	47.2	104	17.5	10.5	21	3.5	2.1
Total	770		77.4	190		19.1	35		3.5

TABLE 8

Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators Spouse or Mate's Income

Income of spouse or mate N = 980	Mobile			Immobile			No Answer		
	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %
Less than $10,000	17	70.8	1.7	5	20.8	.5	2	8.3	.2
$10,000-14,999	44	86.3	4.5	7	13.7	.7			
$15,000-19,999	63	73.3	6.4	18	20.9	1.8	5	5.8	.5
$20,000-24,999	56	77.8	5.7	14	19.4	1.4	2	2.8	.2
$25,000-29,999	44	78.6	4.5	9	16.1	.9	3	5.4	.3
$30,000-34,999	27	79.4	2.8	7	20.6	.7			
$35,000-39,999	11	61.4	1.1	4	22.2	.4	3	16.7	.3
$40,000 or more	29	59.2	3.0	19	38.8	1.9	1	2.0	.1
Not applicable	469	79.5	47.9	101	17.1	10.3	20	3.4	2.0
Total	760		77.6	184		18.8	36		3.7

TABLE 9

Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Holding Academic Appointments and Tenure

Academic appointment N = 1002	Mobile			Immobile			No Answer			Tenure
	No	Row %	Total %	No	Row %	Total %	No	Row %	Total %	
Yes	38	76.0	3.8	6	12.0	.6	6	12.0	.6	No answer
	133	74.7	13.3	38	21.3	3.8	7	3.9	.7	Yes
	146	80.2	14.6	31	17.0	3.1	5	2.7	.5	No
No	445	77.4	44.1	114	19.8	11.4	16	2.8	1.6	No
	11	91.7	1.1	1	8.3	.1				Yes
No response	3	60.0	.3				2	40.0	.2	
Total	776		77.4	190		19.0	36		3.6	

TABLE 10

Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Personal Income

Personal income N = 987	Mobile			Immobile			No Answer		
	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %	No.	Row %	Total %
Less than $10,000	6	100.0	.6						
$10,000-14,999	139	81.3	14.1	29	17.0	2.9	3	1.8	.3
$15,000-19,999	243	77.9	24.6	58	18.6	5.9	11	3.5	1.1
$20,000-24,999	177	75.0	17.9	49	20.8	5.0	10	4.2	1.0
$25,000-29,999	102	75.0	10.3	27	19.9	2.7	7	5.1	.7
$30,000-34,999	61	80.3	6.2	12	15.8	1.2	3	3.9	.3
$35,000-39,999	12	75.0	1.2	6	17.6	.6			
$40,000 or more	27	79.4	2.7	6	17.6	.6	1	2.9	.1
Total	767		77.7	185	18.7		35		3.5

22

VII Conclusions and Recommendations

Three conclusions can be drawn from the findings. Within the limitations of this study, the following conclusions appear warranted:

1. Women administrators demonstrate a propensity toward geographic mobility.
2. Women administrators are generally willing to make geographic changes to accept jobs for economic reasons, such as higher salary, as well as for opportunities for upward professional mobility.
3. The conditions that are generally essential or important enough to justify a change in location for women administrators are job-related rather than based on personal or social preferences.

Women are capable of achieving educationally and of serving as administrators in colleges and universities. They constitute a pool of human resources that can provide the talent necessary to meet the demands of higher education. The 1002 experienced professionals who constituted the population for this study are available for continued employment. Their success in their careers and their willingness to make geographic changes serve as evidence of a commitment to careers and suggest potential contributions they could make.

When recruitment and hiring procedures are conducted on college and university campuses, the findings in this study should be taken into account. To attract women administrators, challenges and opportunity for advancement both in terms of salary and administrative level need to be offered. For most married women administrators, the availability of employment for their husbands is important. Continuing to make stereotypical assumptions about women administrators based on demographic, marital and family, and employment characteristics with respect to their geographic mobility would be inaccurate and risky. Women should be recruited for administrative positions both from the campuses at which they are currently employed as well as other campuses and organizations, regardless of geographic location. The advisors of women who hope to become administrators should make their advisees aware of the relationship of geographic location to upward professional mobility. Women who are administrators are encouraged to pursue jobs that may require relocation in order to attain their career goals.

References

Anderson, P. and Larson, T. *A preliminary analysis of differential characteristics and the professions*. Kansas City: Metropolitan Junior College District, 1972.

Andrulis, D., Iscoe, I., Sikes, M. and Friedman, T. Black professionals in predominately white institutions of higher education—an examination of some demographic and mobility characteristics. *The journal of Negro Education*, 1975, 44, 6-11.

Arter, M.H. The role of women in administration in state universities and land-grant colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1972.

Astin, A.W. Academic administration: The hard core of sexism in academe. *UCLA Educator*, 1977, 19, 60-66.

Astin, H.S. *The woman doctorate in America: Origins, career, and family*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Aurand, C.H. and Blackburn, R.T. Career patterns and job mobility of college and university music faculty. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 1973, 21, 162-168.

Bailyn, L. Notes on the role of choice in psychology of professional women. In R. Lifton (Ed.) *The woman in America*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964, 236-246.

Bernard, J. *Women and the public interest: An essay on policy and protest*. Chicago: Aldine Atherton, 1971.

Berry, B.J.L. and Gillard, Q. *The changing shape of metropolitan America*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger, 1977.

Blackburn, R. and Aurand, C. Mobility studies on academic men: Some methodological concerns and substantive findings. ED 065 092 HE 003 252, Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1972.

Bock, D.J. Women in instructional middle management in California community colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1976.

Bogue, D.J. *A methodological study of migration and labor mobility in Michigan and Ohio in 1947*. Oxford, Ohio: Scripps Foundation Studies in Population, 4, 1952.

Brown, D. *The mobile professors*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Bunting, R.L. Labor mobility: Sex, race, and age. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1960, 44, 229-31.

Bunting, R., Ashby, L. and Prosper, P. Labor mobility in three southern states. *Industrial Labor Relations Review*, 1961, 14, 432-45.

Caplow, T. *The sociology of work*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Caplow, T. and McGee, R. *The academic market place*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Opportunities for women in higher education: Their current participation, prospects for the future, and recommendations for action*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Committee to Study the Status of Women in Graduate Education and Later Careers. *The higher, the fewer*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1974.

Cottingham, W. A study of faculty departures in Florida public junior colleges, February, 1962-February 1964. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1964.

Crane, D. The academic marketplace revisited: A study of faculty mobility using the Carter ratings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1970, 75, 953-964.

De Jesus, A. Factors associated with the attraction and retention of qualified college faculty at Indiana University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1965.

Eldridge, P. and Wolkstein, I. Incidence of employer change. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 1965, 10, 101-107.

Epstein, C.F. *Woman's place: Options and limits in professional careers*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

Erickson, E. *Teacher mobility, teacher dropout and the expectations of family and friends*. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Center for Sociological Research, 1968.

Fecher, A. Career patterns of 650 women administrators in non-typical women's positions in public coeducational institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1973.

Feldman, S.D. *Escape from the doll's house: Women in graduate and professional education*. Report prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Ferris, A. A hypothesis on institutional mobility of teachers in higher education. *College and University*, 1966, 42, 13-28.

Fincher, A. Job mobility of academic physicists in American higher education: A preliminary study. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969. No. 70-4079.

Furniss, W.T. and Graham, P.A. (Ed.) *Women in higher education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1974.

Galloway, L.E. *Geographic mobility in the United States 1957 to 1960*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969.

Galloway, L.E., Gilbert, R.F. and Smith, P.E. The economics of labor mobility: An empirical analysis. *Western Economic Journal*, 1967, 5, 211-223.

Gardner, H.R. Women administrators in higher education in Illinois: A study of current career patterns. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1966.

Gasser, M.H. Career patterns of women administrators in higher education: Barriers and constraints. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1975.

Ginzberg, E. *Educated American women: Life styles and self-portraits*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Goerss, K.V. A study of personality factors of selected women administrators in higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1975.

Goerss, K.V. *Women administrators in education*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1977.

Goldscheider, C. *Population, modernization and social structure*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.

Greenwood, M. Research on internal migration in the United States: A survey, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 1975, 13, 397-433.

Gustad, J. *The career decision of college teachers*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1960.

Gustafson, R.A. and Winstead, R.E. Predicting mobility using personal and geographic characteristics and its use in the needs assessment for vocational programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, February 1973.

Harnischfeger, A. Personal institutional characteristics affecting teacher mobility. Paper presented to annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February 1973.

Hargens, L. and Hagsrom, W. Sponsored and contest mobility of American academic scientists. *Sociology of Education*, 1970, 40, 24-38.

Ingraham, M. *Mirror of brass: Compensation and working conditions of college and university administrators*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Janeway, E. *Man's world woman's place*. New York: Dell, 1971.

Kaufman, H.M. The status of women in administration in selected institutions of higher education in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1961.

Kimmel, E. Job mobility of men and women psychologists in the southeast. HE 004 432, Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1972.

Kosinski, L. and Prothero, R. *People on the move: Studies on internal migration*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1975.

Kreps, J. The woman professional in higher education. In W. Furniss and P. Graham (Eds.) *Women in higher education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1974, 75-94.

Ladinsky, J. The geographic mobility of professional and technical manpower. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 1967, 2, 475-494. (a)

Ladinsky, J. Sources of geographic mobility among professional workers a multivariate analysis. *Demography*, 1967, 4, 292-309. (b)

Lansing, J. and Mueller, E. *The geographic mobility of labor*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1967.

Lifton, R.J. (Ed.) *The woman in America*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Lloyd, C. (Ed.) *Sex, discrimination, and the division of labor*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.

Long, L.H. Women's labor force participation and the residential mobility of families. *Social Forces*, 1974, 52, 342-348.

Marshall, H.D. *The mobility of college faculties*. New York: Pageant Press, 1964.

Mattfield, J.A. Many are called but few are chosen. In W. Furniss and P. Graham (Eds.) *Women in higher education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1974, 121-127.

Mustian, R. and Clifford, W. *Mobility expectancies for the United States, 1948-67: Expected number of moves in an individual's lifetime*. Raleigh: N.C. State University, 1971.

National Council of Administrative Women in Education. *Wanted: More women in education leadership*. Washington: National Education Association, 1965.

Nie, N.H. *SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences* (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Nieboir, N. The administrative women in higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1975.

Niemi, B. The female-male differential in unemployment rates. In C. Lloyd (Ed.) *Sex, discrimination and the division of labor*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975, 61-89.

Oltman, R.M. *Campus 1970: Where do women stand?* Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women, 1970.

Orlich, D. *Idaho teacher mobility — 1965*. Boise: Idaho Education Association, 1966.

Pankin, R.M. Structural factors in academic mobility. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1973, 44, 95-101.

Parnes, H.S. *Research on labor mobility: An appraisal of research findings in the United States*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1954.

Parnes, H.S. and Spitz, R.S. A conceptual framework for studying labor mobility. *Monthly Labor Review*, 1969, 92, 55-58.

Poloma, M.M. and Garland, T. Role conflict and the married professional woman. Paper presented at the Ohio Valley Sociological Society, Cleveland, May 1970.

Robinson, L.H. *The status of academic women*. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1971.

Rossi, A.S. and Calderwood, A. (Ed.) *Academic women on the move*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.

Shapiro, D. *Three aspects of the economics of education in Alberta*. Edmonston: Human Resources Research Council, 1971.

Shea, J.R. *Dual careers: A longitudinal study of labor market experience of women*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1970.

Shryock, H. *Population mobility within the United States*. Chicago: Community and Family Center, University of Chicago, 1964.

Sinclair, A. *The emancipation of the American Woman*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Smith, L. *Economic, demographic, and sociological factors influencing the geographic mobility of young workers*. University, Mississippi: Center for Manpower Studies, 1972.

Somers, G. The returns of geographic mobility: A symposium. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 1967, 2, 427-430.

Stecklein, J. and Lathrop, R. *Faculty attraction and retention*, Minneapolis: Bureau of Institutional Research, 1960.

United States Government Printing Office, *Education Directory: Colleges and Universities, 1976-77*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Higher Education Guidelines (for Executive Order 11246)*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center, *Minnesota Manpower Mobilities*, 1950, Bulletin 10.

Van Alstyne, C. and Withers, J.S. *Women and minorities in higher education administration: Employment patterns and salary comparisons*. Washington, D.C.: College and University Personnel Association, 1977.

Wallston, B.S., Foster, M.A. and Beyer, M. I will follow him: Myth, reality or forced choice—career-decision making by the dual career couple. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Symposium, Chicago, September 1975.

Walsh, P.A. Career patterns of women administrators in higher education institutions in California. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1975.

Wittig, M.A. and Nolfi, S.L. Sex differences in the training, recruitment and employment of psychologists, In P. Woods *Career opportunities for psychologists: Expanding and emerging areas*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1976, 31-48.

Woods, P.J. *Career opportunities for psychologists: Expanding and emerging areas*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1976.

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Conditions Necessary for Women Administrators in Higher Education to Change Location	15
2	Ranked Order of Importance of Conditions Necessary for Women Administrators in Higher Education to Change Locations	16
	Relocation Constraints of Women Administrators in Higher Education	16
4	Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Age	19
5	Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Marital Status	19
6	Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Dependents	20
7	Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Spouse or Mate's Occupation	20
8	Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Spouse or Mate's Income	21
9	Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Holding Academic Appointments and Tenure	21
10	Percentage Distribution of Mobile and Immobile Women Administrators by Personal Income	22